DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 233 HE 014 294

AUTHOR	Carlberg, R. Judson, Ed.
TITLE	Professional Development Through Growth Contracts Handbook, 1981.
INSTITUTION	Gordon Coll., Wenham, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY	Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
PUB DATE	81
NOTE	102p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Gordon College, Wenham, MA ($3.00).
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Advisory Committees; Case Studies; *College Faculty; *Faculty Development; Guidelines; Higher Education; Models; *Performance Contracts; Private Colleges; *Program Administration; Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS	Gordon College MA

ABSTRACT

This manual on faculty growth contracting as done at Gordon College (Massachusetts) is divided into three sections. The first is a progress report on the college's efforts in growth contracts. It discusses the principles of the contracting, difficulties of implementation, unanswered questions (impact on teaching effectivenees, what to do when grants run out, and the realism of individualizing faculty roles through contracts), and some suggestions for other institutions to consider. The second section looks at program evaluation and research. A study of 1977 and 1979 teacher attitudes to the program, other institutions' experiences in adapting the Gordon College model, a University of Michigan evaluation of Gordon's program, possible factors in positive results, the budget, and an individual evaluator's comments are reported. The third section is the Gordon College faculty development manual, which outlines implementation procedures and step-by-step instructions for growth contract participants. Appendices include a sample faculty profile, sample annual plan, sample budget form and ledger sheet, and suggested guidelines for advisory committees. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED206233

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gordon College
D. Jackson Galloway

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH GROWTH CONTRACTS

HANDBOOK

1981

GORDON COLLEGE
WENHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

HE 014 294

This professional monograph was produced

by

Gordon College
Wenham, Massachusetts

with initial assistance for development from

W. K. Kellogg Foundation
Battle Creek, Michigan

Editor

Dr. R. Judson Carlberg
Dean of Faculty, Gordon College
Director of the Faculty Development Program

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION ONE

Faculty Growth Contracting
--A Progress Report--

Introduction	1
Principles for Faculty Growth Contracting	2
Answers to some Thorny Questions	10
Questions Still Looking for Answers	17
Some Modest Suggestions	23
References	30

SECTION TWO

Program Evaluation and Research

Introduction	31
Adapting the Gordon College Model - A Follow-up study	33
Program Evaluation - University of Michigan Team	35
Possible Factors contributing to Positive Results	37
Budget	39
Evaluator's Comments	40

SECTION THREE

Gordon College
Faculty Development Manual

I.	Introduction	44
	A. Background	44
	B. Definition of Responsibilities	46
II.	Procedures for Implementation	48
	A. Table of Procedures	48
	B. Instructions for Participants	51

II. Procedures for Implementation 48

A. Table of Procedures 48
B. Instructions for Participants 51

STEP ONE — Preparation of Individual Profile 51

STEP TWO — Profile Conference 55

STEP THREE — Preparation of First Draft of Annual Individual Development Plan 56

STEP FOUR — Submission of Profile and First Draft of Annual Plan to F.D.C. 66

STEP FIVE — Preparation of Final Draft of Annual Plan 66

STEP SIX — Submission of Final Draft of Annual Plan to F.D.C. 68

STEP SEVEN — Carrying Out of Annual Plan 68

STEP EIGHT — Assessment of Growth 71

STEP NINE — Submission of Final Report to F.D.C. 72

Appendix I — Sample Faculty Profile 73
(Profile Outline Foldout) 74

Appendix II — Sample Annual Plan 83
(IDP Outline Foldout) 84

Appendix III — Sample IDP Budget Form 92
Sample Ledger Sheet 93

Appendix IV — Suggested Guidelines for Advisory Committees 95

Editor's Note: The three major sections of this handboo are designed for distinctly different audiences. Sections on and two provide general insights and limited research data on faculty growth contracting. Section three is a user's manual Each section may be used separately. Therefore, major themes are purposely repeated in each section to provide continuity and clarity.

FACULTY GROWTH CONTRACTING
--A PROGRESS REPORT--

INTRODUCTION

In January 1976 Gordon College instituted a program of faculty development by growth contracting, supported by a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. The initial seed for this program had been sown in 1974 by Gordon's Academic Vice-President, Richard F. Gross, now President of the college, on the basis of a suggestion by Harold Hodgkinson (1973) that faculty growth contracts are a viable way to demonstrate professional competence when dealing with issues of faculty reward. Earlier, Gaff and Wilson, (1971, p. 400) had suggested "individualized contracts" as a useful approach for evaluation of faculty as well as for differentiating faculty responsibilities. Gross (1976, p. 74) described growth contracts as "a systematic approach to defining faculty roles, charting the direction of professional growth, and assessing one's performance".

THE PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Gordon's growth contracting program can be briefly described as follows: each participating faculty member writes a faculty profile that contains an assessment of strengths and weaknesses, a statement of current faculty roles, an assessment of effectiveness in carrying out these roles, and a statement of long-range professional and personal goals, typically for a period of from three to five years. This profile then forms the basis for a

series of yearly individual development p'ans (growth contracts) intended to cumulatively implement one's long-range goals. Each growth contract consists of statements of specific goals for the year, with each goal accompanied by a description of intended means of accomplishment and assessment, and a budget request. The participant also chooses an Advisory Committee, primarily made up of faculty colleagues, whose purpose is to help the participant to refine his growth contract, to give advice during the year of implementation, and then to write an assessment of goal accomplishment to accompany the participant's self-assessment at the end of the calendar year.

What follows is a progress report of what we have learned in our three years of operation under this program. This will include a description of the general principles that have been the theoretical basis for our program, answers to some difficult questions that arose as we attempted to implement these principles, a consideration of some questions still looking for answers, and some modest suggestions for those who would like to implement growth contracting at other institutions.

PRINCIPLES FOR FACULTY GROWTH CONTRACTING

The following broad principles have informed Gordon's growth contracting since its inception. Our efforts to implement these principles led to significant questions, some of which are noted below. Attempts to respond to these questions are given later in the report.

1. *Growth contracts should be individualized to reflect the faculty member's own perceived needs for growth in light of individual strengths and weaknesses.*

Our program did not start with a preconceived definition of faculty development intended to apply equally to all faculty members. Rather it started with the assumption that each faculty member has some awareness of his or her professional and personal needs, and has a natural desire to address those needs.

As reported by Milley (1977, pp. 7-9), this individualized approach toward faculty development is not as common as the collective approach, often centered around workshops, that deals with such perennial topics as teaching methods and philosophies of teaching, with the implicit assumption being that all faculty members have more or less the same professional needs. Of course a danger of the individualized approach is that without proper safeguards, growth contracts can become so idiosyncratic that there will be no assurance of meeting the needs of the institution in terms of its teaching, research, and/or community commitments. Can such safeguards be designed without destroying the emphasis on individual growth?

2. *Faculty members are whole persons who need to grow in all areas of professional responsibility as well as in personal areas not directly related to their professions.*

Faculty members were encouraged to address themselves to areas of professional responsibility that went beyond their traditional teaching and research roles. For example,

the development of counseling and student advising skills, or the development of administrative skills for chairing committees or departments were considered legitimate aspects of growth contracts.

More radically, faculty members were encouraged to include goals of a more personal nature that were only indirectly related to professional responsibilities. As might be guessed this led to some interesting internal debates, such as the one as to whether a physics professor might request tickets to the Boston Symphony as a means toward refining his aesthetic sensitivity. Again, the crucial question appears to be: How does one insure that institutional needs are met while still allowing for some measure of personal growth in areas only remotely related to institutional responsibilities?

3. *Within the context of common responsibilities shared by all faculty, there should be opportunity for individualizing the role of a given faculty member on the basis of particular strengths and weaknesses.*

The overall aim of this principle is the development of a strong faculty in which diverse gifts complement each other. For example, all faculty have some instructional responsibility. However, there may be room for individualizing teaching assignments within that common responsibility. Gross (1976, p. 75) notes an ideal case where "Faculty with particular strengths in lecturing and administrative organization ... may be assigned to teach large classes, while others, who may not be good lecturers but who have gifts relative to discussion and tutorial

methods of instruction, may be assigned seminar courses, guidance of independent study projects, or supervision of practicum experiences".

This principle also allows for the possibility of fairly radical role redefinition such as a faculty member building into his profile the long-range goal of moving into an administrative position. Since all faculty profiles are discussed in depth with the Dean of the Faculty, the possibility of making such a change within the college can be assessed at an early stage. Of course the college may be preparing the participant for an administrative position elsewhere. This possibility of radical role redefinition takes into account the not uncommon need for mid-life career transition discussed in some of the recent literature on the stages of adult development (see Hodgkinson, 1974).

In practice, some preliminary steps have been taken toward this ideal of individualization of role within the context of common faculty responsibilities. But some difficult questions of implementation arise. To what extent can such an ideal be realized in a small college setting? Can such an ideal be harmonized with the traditional reward system for promotion and tenure?

4. *The success of individual efforts to achieve growth will be best realized when growth contracts are self-designed and self-imposed.*

This principle partially reflects the view that "faculty are a particular breed of professionals and vigorously resist any external attempts to impose restrictions on their mode of functioning" (Gross, 1976, p. 76). More basically it reflects the prior assumption that each faculty member has some awareness of his or her professional and personal needs, and will initiate steps to address those needs. Again, the issue of how one maintains this principle and still insures that institutional needs are met is crucial, and will be discussed later.

In light of this principle, growth contracting at Gordon is strictly voluntary. In 1976, 1977, and 1978, seventy-five percent (39) of the faculty wrote growth contracts. Since the inception of this program in 1976, all but one of the college's fifty-two faculty members have written at least one growth contract.

5. *Successful growth contracting requires that faculty be specific in their statements of goals and in their descriptions of means of accomplishment and assessment.*

What we had to learn the hard way in attempting to implement this principle could fill a book. From the very beginning we sensed a predisposition on the part of some faculty to rebel against the very idea of committing themselves to specific written goals. For some the disagreement was philosophical; all this talk of specific goals and assessments seemed to buy into an overly quantitative type of mentality that questions the validity of those important

qualities that cannot be measured. For others, the disagreement was more practical: "It's a waste of time to put all of this down on paper. I know what I want to do; I know how to go about doing it; and I know how well I'm doing". But the majority of the faculty were willing to give it a try. The problem now was that almost all of us were totally inexperienced in how to go about it. How does one overcome these dual difficulties without turning off the faculty?

6. *Growth contracting should be viewed as a means for a faculty member to generate positive evidence in support of promotion and tenure consideration; but the emphasis must be on individual development, with institutional evaluation a secondary by-product.*

This principle is an expression of the conviction that "Faculty growth contracts should be *related to the institutional reward system*" (Gross, 1976, p. 76). The original intent of President Gross was that "The outcomes of individually devised plans *should* [italics mine] provide an important perspective on such decisions as promotions, tenure, salary increments, and other personnel decisions" (Gross, 1976, p. 76). This initial intent was tempered somewhat as the program evolved in the hands of the Faculty Development Committee (FDC) that was given responsibility for implementing this program. To understand this it is necessary to briefly describe the nature of promotion and tenure considerations at Gordon.

In order to obtain promotion or tenure the faculty member must provide the Faculty Senate, made up of seven elected

full professors, with concrete evidence that he measures up to suitably defined "merit" (as opposed to "acceptable") levels of attainment in at least two of the following three categories: Ability as a Teacher; Scholarly and Professional Attainment; Institutional Usefulness. The onus is clearly on the faculty member to provide positive evidence, via student evaluations, faculty activities reports, copies of publications, and any other means he sees fit to use.

In light of this evaluation procedure it was very natural for the Faculty Development Committee to set the policy that a faculty member *may choose* to include in his professional file the results of his own self-assessments and the assessments of his Advisory Committee relative to accomplishment of his contract goals, for eventual consideration by the Faculty Senate when he comes up for promotion or tenure. But such a decision is a voluntary one made solely by the faculty member, thus tempering somewhat the original intention. Of course, if a faculty member does not choose to use this sort of evidence, he must generate alternative positive evidence in support of promotion or tenure. In the event that a faculty member is denied promotion or tenure, the Faculty Senate has been given the prerogative of requesting that a growth contract be initiated for the purpose of remedying specific weaknesses.

In his 1977 report to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, our Academic Dean, R. Judson Carlberg, reported that "most faculty members have not generally inserted either their self-assessment of growth or the assessment of their ... Evaluation [Advisory] Committee in their personnel file ... They

have been more likely to include their growth plan and the scholarly work completed under it". This is consistent with the following results reported by Milley (1977, p. 444) for participants in the 1976 growth contract program at Gordon: Fifty-eight percent (of 38 faculty members) disagreed with the opinion that Advisory Committee assessments of goal attainment should be used as part of the promotion and tenure decision process (37% agreed; 5% were undecided); 55% disagreed with the opinion that self-assessment of goal attainment should be used in personnel decisions (29% agreed; 15% were uncertain). It appears that Gordon faculty do not generally favor using evaluative data from growth contracting in personnel decisions. Is it possible that these opinions reflect a general uneasiness about the rigor and validity of both self and peer assessment?

7. *Growth contracting should encourage innovation and experimentation by maximizing the potential for reward for successful attainment of goals while minimizing the penalty of failure.*

This principle is consistent with the opinion expressed by the Group for Human Development in Higher Education that "like students, teachers need opportunities to play from uncertainty as well as tested strength, to try new things, and to stumble: -- Any teacher should be able to get advice about teaching, try out new techniques, monitor his or her own performance, receive information and confidential criticism, observe the work of other teachers, and discuss common problems -- all without prejudice to administrative decisions about tenure or salary" ("Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment," Change Publication, 1974, p. 61).

The connections established between growth contracting and considerations for promotion and tenure (as described under principle 6) seem to be a workable means for implementing this present principle, especially the policy of giving the faculty member the option to choose which, if any, of his goal assessments are to be included in the case he must build for himself in order to merit promotion or tenure.

8. *Growth contracting should seek after the ideal of creating a sense of community wherein persons are helping other persons to grow.*

This lofty principle is based on the assumption that each member of the academic community is a potential resource for other members. Although growth contracts are individualized, a faculty member's growth should not take place separate from the shaping force of colleagues. Rather the program should encourage the individual to seek dialogue with and helpful assessment by peers. This was the rationale behind the establishment of Advisory Committees. Is such a lofty ideal significantly realizable anywhere, least of all on a college campus?

ANSWERS TO SOME THORNY QUESTIONS

It's one thing to state general principles. It's another to try to implement them. The various questions noted in the above section on principles reflect some of the difficulties of implementation that we encountered. We now share some of the things we learned the hard way as answers to these questions slowly evolved.

1. *Faculty development programs that emphasize individual growth based on perceived strengths and weaknesses must have safeguards for insuring that institutional needs are also met.*

What about areas of personal growth only remotely related to institutional responsibilities (e.g., tickets to the Boston Symphony)? The policy eventually evolved that such items were legitimate aspects of personal growth, and could be included in growth contracts. However, due to limited funding, such personal goals could not receive monies unless the participant could demonstrate that they made a significant contribution to at least one of the following three areas: strengthening Gordon as an institution for Christian higher education; contributing to the development of students; contributing to disciplinary or inter-disciplinary scholarship. This decision was the first of two safeguards intended to insure that our emphasis on individual growth would not be detrimental to the meeting of institutional needs.

A second safeguard is built into Gordon's present criteria for promotion and tenure which require evidence of merit in at least two of the three fairly traditional areas of teaching effectiveness, scholarship, and institutional usefulness, with these categories defined so as to meet institutional as well as faculty needs. The faculty member has been given considerable freedom in his choice of contract goals, but *if* he chooses to use growth contracting as a means for building positive evidence for promotion or tenure, it behooves him to pay attention to these categories.

In light of the above safeguards it is interesting to note the distribution of types of contract goals chosen by 1976 Cordon participants, as reported by Milley (1977, pp. 364-366): Instructional Development (37% of 155 goals); Scholarly and Professional Development (42%); Personal Nonprofessional Development (4%); Religious Development (6%); Development Related to Student Services (4%); Miscellaneous (7%). The low percentage (4%) of strictly personal goals no doubt reflects the policy decision not to fund such items. The high preponderance of goals in the teaching and scholarly areas may reflect a general feeling on the part of the faculty that their upward mobility as professionals is primarily tied to their growth in these two areas in comparison to what might fall under the category of institutional usefulness.

Note the relatively non-directive approach taken in the above safeguards. From the very inception of the program the faculty pressed the Faculty Development Committee for some prescriptions as to allowable types of goal activities, the priorities concerning which types would be deemed most valuable. We now believe that one of the keys to the significant success of our program has been this committee's refusal to establish such prescriptions; at first because we didn't have the foggiest idea how to do it, but later because we saw the merits of a more non-directive approach. We eventually had to establish some guidelines, like the above safeguards, for weeding out or at least discouraging certain types of "unusual" goal activities. But through it all we seem to have maintained fidelity to the crucial principles that growth contracts are to be self-designed and self-imposed, and should be individualized

to reflect each faculty member's own perceived needs for growth. Additional negative guidelines that gradually evolved included the following: funding would not be available for student assistant activities designed to relieve a faculty member of his *normal* teaching responsibilities so that he can put more time into his growth contract; and funding would not be available for remunerating faculty for summer work (not because the idea isn't a good one, but simply because of limited funding capabilities).

2. *In its initial stages, growth contracting requires an unusually heavy time commitment for working one-on-one with individual faculty members, helping them to design the details of their contracts.*

Growth contracting was new to most of us, the faculty-at-large as well as the five of us on the Faculty Development Committee. It soon became apparent that we (the FDC) would have to try to convince some faculty of the importance of being specific in their statements of goals and in their descriptions of means of accomplishment and assessment, and then help them to get it down on paper. Our first rule was to avoid the educational jargon (behavioral objectives, change agents, evaluation assessment feedback cycle, etc.). We emphasized the common sense approach of simply putting down on paper what one is continuously doing mentally when planning, and pointed out the clarification benefit of trying to be specific in articulating such plans. We then provided the faculty with some simple examples of both well-and-poorly stated goals, means of accomplishment, and means of assessment. Participating faculty were then asked to write first drafts of growth contracts.

Now the work really began. In the first year of the program, largely due to our own inexperience, all five members of the FDC carefully read all 39 first drafts. In general we found that these first drafts left much to be desired. Goals tended to be vague and too global to be realizable during the contract period, and much too little thought had been given to viable means for assessing the extent of accomplishment. Each reader carefully noted criticisms. Each FDC member was then assigned to seven or eight participants. He wrote detailed letters to each of his participants summarizing various "suggestions" for improvement (very low-key). In a number of cases this was followed up by considerable discussion with the faculty member. All the work paid off. Many of the final drafts were hardly recognizable, they had improved so significantly.

What seemed so difficult at first, the generating of specific details of a growth contract, has become second nature in a matter of three years. This has enabled the work of the FDC to be somewhat streamlined. But their responsibility is still extremely time consuming.

3. *The extent to which participants in growth contracting are helped by peers on their Advisory Committee varies significantly from person to person, both in terms of input during the term of the contract and extent of rigor in assessing goal accomplishment.*

One of our lofty dreams was that the use of Advisory Committees would enhance the sense of community on campus. We hoped that participants would seek dialogue with and helpful assessment

from peers. There is evidence of increase in such dialogue, but generally between faculty who already were interacting with each other. There is little evidence that growth contracting has significantly broadened our sense of community by bringing together faculty who seldom interact. However, it should be noted that many would judge that there already was a reasonably strong sense of community on our small campus prior to this program. All of the above judgments are matters of opinions that could be debated.

In the first year of our program the role of the Advisory Committee (then called the Evaluation Committee) was highly structured. For instance, set meeting times between participants and their full Advisory Committees were called for. We soon found that participants generally preferred to work one-on-one with certain individuals on their advisory committees as the need arose rather than at set times. It was not unusual for these individuals to have been chosen for this advisory function because they were already close personal friends with the participants. We soon relaxed our Advisory Committee structuring to accommodate these preferences, despite the fact that this change does not seem to contribute to a broadening of the sense of community. But then again, the idea of community can certainly not be legislated.

Probably our biggest disappointment with the growth contracting program has been the frequent lack of rigor in the Advisory Committee assessments of the extent of goal accomplishment of participants. The reasons for this may be

varied. It would not be surprising if this at least partially reflects the natural concern that to be too critical of a colleague might one day adversely affect his evaluations for promotion and/or tenure (despite the fact that it is the participant's choice as to whether to include growth contract assessments in the data pool for promotion or tenure). Another possible reason is the general belief that a participant is really the only one in a good position to evaluate his or her attainment of individualized goals, and therefore Advisory Committee evaluations are at best a formal exercise not to be taken too seriously. The existence of such a belief seems to be supported by the following data collected from 1976 participants (Milley, 1977, p. 444): 79% (N=38) agreed with the statement "I believe that I am best qualified to evaluate the attainment of my I.D.P. [growth contract] goals" (11% disagreed; 11% were undecided).

The above results seem to be consistent with some recent research results that question the validity of faculty colleague ratings (see Smith, 1976, pp. 32-36). This research also calls faculty self-ratings into question. Such research suggests that colleague assessments and self-ratings should at best be one source from among many sources of data to be used for promotion and tenure considerations (Smith, 1976, p. 36). Fortunately, this is currently the case at Gordon.

QUESTIONS STILL LOOKING FOR ANSWERS

We have learned a lot about growth contracting over the past few years, and have been pleased with the apparent success of our program. But in addition to some of the problems encountered above, there are still some crucial questions for which we don't have complete answers. Here are some of them.

1. *What positive impact has growth contracting made on teaching effectiveness?*

We do not yet have a clear answer to this question, not because we think it unimportant, for we view ourselves primarily as a teaching institution, but because we have not established easy ways to measure this impact. In fact, we are open to the possibility that there are no easy ways, for the impact on classroom teaching may prove, at least in part, to be very subtle.

But we do have some positive indicators. The fact that 37% of all 1976 contract goals were devoted to "Instructional Development" (Milley, 1977, p. 364) is a positive sign, assuming a reasonable degree of goal accomplishment (although we have no specific data on self and Advisory Committee assessments relative to these particular instructional type goals, the available data on overall assessments for *all* 1976 goals were as follows (Milley, 1977, p. 171): Self-Assessments -- 77 goals substantially fulfilled; 47 goals partially fulfilled; 9 goals not fulfilled at all; Advisory Committee Assessments -- 63 substantially, 38 partially, 3 not at all). Of course this data must be tempered by the previously expressed concerns about the validity of self and Advisory Committee assessments.

Additional positive indicators are the following responses of 1976 participants (N=38), as reported by Milley (1977, p. 444): 58% agreed with the statement "I believe that my teaching has improved as a result of participation in the faculty development program" (21% disagreed; 21% were uncertain); 61% disagreed with the statement "I believe that the faculty development program has *not* had a positive impact on the development of students" (11% agreed; 29% were uncertain).

Of course, the subjective nature of most of the above data suggests that we have at best hints of positive impact on teaching. Eventually we will attempt a more rigorous answer to this question, using as a portion of our data the evaluations we have already gathered from students and faculty colleagues relative to the specific instructional goals of past participants.

2. *What happens when the grant money runs out?*

We don't know! The availability of significant amounts of money has certainly been a major factor contributing to the apparent success of our program, for it has enabled faculty to pursue numerous projects that simply cannot be done without financial resources. This six year program has a total budget of $350,000 with $127,000 provided by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and the rest provided by Gordon on a sliding scale that requires total college support in the last two years. In 1978, a total of $31,300 was allocated

to growth contracts, with an average of $1,000 granted to each of 10 faculty members having sabbatical leaves (each faculty member is entitled to a one quarter sabbatical every four years), and an average of $750 granted to 28 faculty members not having sabbatical leaves. (Note, however, that the college's contribution comes in part from sabbatical, travel and other similar accounts of long standing, which represent some ongoing commitment to faculty development).

The money is certainly attractive. It is doubtful that the program could have gotten off the ground without substantial funding. It probably would have been viewed as too much work (or busywork) for too little return. But there is some evidence that now that the program is established some version of it would continue should major funding run out. For example, 66% of thirty-eight 1976 participants disagreed with the statement "If program funds were not available, I would see little value in participating in the program" (24% agreed; 11% were uncertain -- Milley, 1977, p. 444). Possibly this positive mood reflects the inherent value discovered in periodically attempting to clarify one's goals and articulating means for getting there. However, it is doubtful that the current highly structured version of this program would flourish should funding become unavailable. It might again be a matter of too much work for too little return.

3. *Is the ideal of individualizing the role of a given faculty member on the basis of particular strengths and weaknesses a fiction, especially in light of traditional faculty reward systems?*

Some steps are being taken at Gordon toward individualizing certain faculty roles in light of strengths and weaknesses. Faculty committee assignments are generally made on the basis of perceived strengths and interests. Wherever possible, large lecture classes are assigned to those considered to be the most capable teachers. But most of these steps were in existence prior to our growth contracting program. There is little current evidence that this program has brought about significant new stides toward the ideal of individualizing faculty roles. For example, maybe consideration ought to be given to the radical possibility that a given faculty member be relieved *completely* of one area of current responsiblilty (chosen from the four areas of teaching, student advising, administrative or committee work, and scholarly research), in order to increase his assignment in an area of strength (chosen from the remaining three).

The fact that growth contracting has not yet brought about significant individualization of faculty roles may be due in part to the youthfulness of the program. But there are probably more substantial reasons. For one, a relatively small and busy faculty (52 faculty for about 1,000 students) can seldom afford the luxury of choosing its assignments strictly according to strengths. Any radical reduction of a given faculty member's responsibility in a given area assumes there is someone else with the complementary interest and strength to pick up the slack, which may be a questionable assumption in a small college with many two or three person departments.

However, the most significant reason why the principle of individualization of role according to strengths may be difficult to implement is that it runs counter to traditional academic reward systems. Whereas this ideal principle "precludes setting the expectation that all faculty should perform or achieve in exactly the same fashion", the fact of the matter is that "the criteria most often used in the evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure fail to recognize the differing strengths of faculty and often allow little latitude for individualized achievements" (Gross, 1976, p. 76).

In brief, most academic reward systems are rather unforgiving of weakness. At Gordon, promotion or tenure requires evidence of merit performance in at least two of the traditional categories of teaching, scholarship, and institutional usefulness (with this latter category including student advising as well as administrative and committee work). And merit in teaching means being very good with both large lower-division courses and small tutorials. The only apparent concession to weakness is that one need only rate "acceptable" in the third category, but this still assumes a reasonable level of attainment. Now this "all-around man" emphasis in faculty assignments and evaluation may be unavoidable or even desirable at a small college. But if this is the case, then we must admit the limitation it places on the ideal of individualizing faculty roles on the basis of particular strengths.

It is possible that this ideal is more realizable at a large institution, like a university, but it would still take some rethinking of the institutional reward system, especially if it currently wears blinders with respect to strengths in areas other than scholarly research. In any case, great care must be taken to insure that the expectations of the institutional reward system are consistent with any attempts at individualization of faculty roles.

Albert Smith (1976, pp. 53-59) has reported on a number of faculty evaluation programs (for promotion and/or tenure) that can be viewed as attempts to bring the academic reward system more in line with the concept of individualizing faculty roles. In one of these (Burlington County Community College in Pemberton, N.J.), a committee on faculty evaluation has developed a list of 26 criteria in the two categories of instructional performance and college community responsibilities, on the basis of which faculty design annual objectives (contract goals). Thirteen of the 17 criteria in instructional performance are required, in that all faculty must have annual objectives based on them, while six of the nine criteria in the area of the college community are required. (Smith, 1976, p. 56). This approach appears to have sufficient flexibility to build a certain amount of individualization of role into the procedures for personnel evaluation.

D. SOME MODEST SUGGESTIONS IF THE THOUGHT OF GROWTH CONTRACTING HAS CROSSED YOUR MIND

How transferable is the concept of growth contracting? Diverse institutions have expressed interest in the idea, ranging from small liberal arts colleges like Gordon to large universities, and even to church organizations concerned about the growth of their ministers. There has been discussion of using growth contracting for administrator development (Gross, 1977), and for in-service training of elementary and secondary-school teachers. There is at least one small university (Ottawa University in Ottawa, Kansas) that has built the major portion of its educational program around the facilitating of comprehensive student development by means of a form of growth contracting. It is impossible to comment on all these variations here. Rather, some modest, and possibly obvious, suggestions will be made for the sake of readers who may be contemplating growth contracting as a means for faculty development at another institution for higher education. You will have to judge as to whether any of these suggestions are applicable to other types of institutions or constituencies.

1. *Create a unique institutional approach to faculty development in light of your institution's character, needs, and value commitments.*

Don't equate faculty development with growth contracting. There are a variety of alternative approaches to faculty development that may better suit your institution. (See Smith, 1976, pp. 37-49 for brief descriptions of some alternative programs.)

The place to start is with an analysis of your own institution. It might be helpful to see how certain aspects of such an analysis seemed to suggest the feasibility of growth contracting at Gordon. In the mid 1970's the institution was experiencing a low rate of faculty turnover, with a resulting increase in the proportion of tenured full professors. There was concern that this could lead to a lack of the new approaches and fresh perspectives that might characterize a more mobile faculty. This suggested the need for an internal program which would encourage attempts at innovation and experimentation. Another factor was the national trend toward greater emphasis on accountability as applied to faculty productivity, suggesting the need for creative approaches for assessing faculty performance. But this theme was tempered by institutional commitment to the importance of faculty, as professionals, retaining the initiative in defining their roles and developmental needs (Gross, 1976, p. 74). Furthermore, the college's commitment to the teachings of Christianity suggested the need for further enhancing a sense of community where persons genuinely care for one another and are concerned about each other's growth. These factors and others (see Gross, 1974, pp. 74, 75) suggested the desirability of growth contracting and, in particular, that version of it embodied in the eight basic principles previously presented.

Your approach to faculty development must reflect the nature of your institution, not the way you would like it to be, but the way it is, including whatever external constraints are placed on you.

2. *If growth contracting seems applicable to your institution, don't adopt Gordon College's program.*

Our eight basic principles for growth contracting reflect the nature of our institution. Aspects of these principles may be totally inapplicable to your institution. Three brief examples will suffice to illustrate this. First, our principles suggest the need for a faculty member to frankly share with colleagues not only his strengths, but also his own assessment of weaknesses and needs for growth. To do so is to make oneself vulnerable. This procedure presupposes an atmosphere of trust where a person will not feel threatened by the thought of honestly disclosing his weaknesses. By and large this type of atmosphere has seemed prevalent throughout our program, and this practice has seemed to be workable, no doubt helped along by the various buffer layers between such disclosures and eventual judgments concerning promotion and tenure. How viable this type of public disclosure of weakness and need for growth is on your campus is a question that you alone can answer.

Secondly, there is some question as to whether our principle of individualization of faculty role in light of particular strengths can be realized significantly on our own campus. You will have to judge its feasibility on yours.

Finally, our connection between growth contracting and promotion and tenure considerations may be totally inapplicable to your campus due to various internal and external constraints that your institution might have on faculty advancement procedures. There is little doubt that establishing a workable

connection of your own will be the most important as well as the most difficult aspect of your design should you decide on faculty growth contracting. We can only repeat the following general recommendations based on our experience:

3. *In growth contracting, emphasize development first, with evaluation for advancement as a secondary by-product; eliminate or minimize discrepancies between your expectations for growth contracting and the expectations of your faculty reward system; try to maximize the potential for reward for successful attainment of goals, at the same time that you encourage experimentation by minimizing the penalty of failure.*

The primary emphasis should be on helping people, not just judging them. If your program is viewed by faculty as just another clever way for administrators or external agencies to judge faculty performance for salary and/or advancement purposes, then it probably won't get off the ground, and maybe it shouldn't. In our experience it was a wise move to assign the task of implementing a growth contracting program to a new faculty committee (the Faculty Development Committee) rather than assigning it to the existing committee (the Faculty Senate) that had previously been responsible for faculty development, but whose main responsibility was to make promotion and tenure judgments. This separation of responsibilities helped to make credible the claim of the FDC that its main concern was to help fellow faculty to grow.

4. *Create a climate of readiness.*

The idea of growth contracting can be threatening. It takes a significant amount of getting used to. The benefits often do not become obvious until after you try it. This suggests the desirability of a relatively small pilot project. At Gordon such a trial run was undertaken a full two years before the start of a faculty-wide program. The pilot participants consisted of the Academic Vice President and four tenured full professors, all respected members of the Faculty Senate. The fact that these academic leaders were the first to be willing to spell out their weaknesses and needs for growth before the entire faculty did much to create the general climate of trust that seems to have characterized the program.

5. *Give your growth contracting program the freedom to evolve.*

It is important that you initially develop some general principles for your program, principles that reflect the character and needs of your faculty and institution. But don't wait to start until you think you have all the details of implementation worked out on paper. You can't foresee all the implementation problems that may arise until you actually try out a tentative version of the program. Be flexible as you try to implement your program and allow for a considerable amoung of trial and error.

6. *Provide budgetary support for growth contracting.*

The inherent value of clarifying one's goals and ways of getting there, and of drawing on colleague help and advice through growth contracting will probably not justify in the minds of the faculty the work involved in participating in a structured program, especially in the initial stages when these values may seem like so much pie in the sky. The faculty need to feel that this program is helping them to do things that they couldn't do otherwise. And that generally takes money.

The need for budgetary support does not necessarily demand external funding, although it certainly is a big help. At Gordon institutional funds already being devoted to a diversity of faculty development activities (e.g., faculty travel and sabbatical leaves) were pooled for redistribution under the more unified growth contracting program. There may be some similar way for you to combine existing internal monies, or, more drastically, to rearrange your institution's funding priorities so as to finance growth contracting from within.

7. *Create faculty ownership of the program.*

A good way to kill the idea of growth contracting is to impose a full blown program on the faculty from above, either through the administration or an external agency. You have the greatest chance of success if your program is developed and run by the faculty, with suitable external input to insure that institutional needs and requirements will be met.

At Gordon the seed for the program was sown by an academic administrator who suggested some general principles that could guide growth contracting, and initiated the pilot project. But then he very wisely (in our estimation) gave the task of refining and implementing these principles to a Faculty Development Committee. In line with the terms of the Kellogg grant our program is ultimately administered by the current Academic Dean, who is expected to devote approximately twenty percent of his time to the program, and who is a member (though not chairman) of the FDC. The other members of the FDC consist of one elected faculty representative from each of the five academic divisions. The task assigned to this committee required an unusually heavy commitment of time and energy, especially in the initial years when we were learning what it was all about. This should be taken into account if and when you form such a committee.

CONCLUSION

It is our opinion that the faculty growth contracting program at Gordon has been a noteworthy success. But the purpose of this report has not been to pat ourselves on the back. We have tried to be frank in disclosing the difficulties we have encountered, our responses to some of these difficulties, and the questions we still face at this point in our progress. Our hope is that you the reader may benefit from our experiences.

REFERENCES

Gaff, J.G., and Wilson, R.C., "The Teaching Environment", AAUP Bulletin, 1971, Vol. 57, pp. 475-593.

Gross, R.F., "Faculty Growth Contracts", Educational Horizons, Winter 1976, Vol. 55, No. 2, pp. 74-79.

_____. "Facilitating Administrator Development Through Growth Contracts"; a paper presented at the conference "Running Higher Education" cosponsored by the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges and the American Association for Higher Education, Arlie House, Warrenton, Virginia, February 4, 1977.

Hodgkinson, H.L., "Faculty Reward and Assessment Systems". In The Tenure Debate, B.L. Smith (ed.), San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, 1973.

_____. "Adult Development: Implications for Faculty and Administrators", Educational Record, Fall 1974, Vol. 55, No. 4, pp. 263-274.

Milley, J.E., A Case Study Approach to the Evaluation of a Faculty Development Program Which Uses Individual Development Plans, Ph.D. Dissertation, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y. 1977.

Smith, A.B., Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education, ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 8, The American Association of Higher Education, Washington, D.C.

PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

INTRODUCTION

Several research studies have been conducted on the Gordon College program of faculty development and subsequent efforts to disseminate information. A major nine-month long evaluation of the first year of the faculty development program at Gordon College was completed in 1977 by Dr. Jane Milley, now associate dean, School of Fine Arts, California State University at Long Beach. Dr. Milley's original research was conducted while she was a doctoral student at Syracuse working under the supervision of Dr. Edward Kelly.

Dr. Milley's formative research provided the Gordon Faculty Development Committee with valuable data which was subsequently used to strengthen both procedures and policies.

In a follow-up to her original 1977 work, Dr. Milley returned to Gordon College in 1979 to survey faculty attitudes toward the program after three years of experience. The results of her study showed that there was little change in participants' attitudes toward the program from 1977 to 1979. For example, 92% of the faculty in 1977 believed the program was satisfactory and should be continued, as contrasted with 97% in 1979. The overall mean scale showed little difference between the two groups (2.24 in 1977 to 2.20 in 1979.)

Although there were many similarities between the two groups, Dr. Milley did identify some points of differentiation. As reported below 1979 participants

felt they needed more funds to complete their IDPs; seemed to be more realistic about setting realistic and attainable goals; and appeared to be more favorable toward having students included as members of the advisory committees which had both support and evaluative responsibilities.

Reported below are some of Milley's recent research findings.

Results of Miley Comparative Study
1977 and 1979
(Under the Gordon Faculty Development Program)

Statement	'77 Agree	'79 Agree	'77 Undecided	'79 Undecided	'77 Disagree	'79 Disagree
Paperwork required is excessive.	39	32	8	11	53	57
I received adequate funds.	92	74	5	6	3	20
Research activity has not increased.	16	0	29	31	55	69
I am not satisfied with my goal fulfillment.	39	29	3	20	58	51
Participation in professional meetings increased.	76	77	18	23	5	0
Individual Development Plan (IDP) goals too ambitious.	63	29	0	20	37	51
Not enough flexibility in program.	8	6	5	6	87	89
Student development not effected.	11	3	29	31	61	66
Little value if no funds available.	24	43	11	20	66	37
My teaching has improved.	58	11	21	14	21	74
Committee assessments should be for promotion.	37	20	5	17	58	62
Participation should be required.	21	6	5	6	74	89

Statement	'77 Agree	'79 Agree	'77 Undecided	'79 Undecided	'77 Disagree	'79 Disagree
Self-assessments should be used for promotion.	29	29	16	20	55	51
Pursuit of unusual goals was stimulated.	26	29	26	14	47	57
Colleagues' self-assessments are accurate.	47	57	45	37	8	6
Evaluation Committee (EC) should not be required.	18	17	8	20	74	63
EC final evaluation was fair.	58	57	34	40	8	3
EC should not evaluate my goals.	11	6	13	17	76	77
Documentation was a waste of time.	21	26	18	34	61	40
Student evaluation should be used.	74	54	21	31	5	14
EC should include one outsider.	0	0	16	26	84	74
Participants should consult with EC when needed.	58	67	13	6	29	26
EC should assist with my IDP design.	61	40	18	14	21	46
Students should not be included in EC.	37	29	16	11	47	60
Progress reports should be submitted to EC.	42	43	29	23	23	34

ADAPTING THE GORDON COLLEGE MODEL: A FOLLOW-UP STUDY

In 1977, Gordon College held a conference to disseminate the concepts associated with growth planning. Approximately 120 participants from across the nation came to the College as the guests of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and Gordon. During the three day conference, participants were presented with the basic components of the individual development

approach to faculty growth.

To assess the impact of various dissemination techniques, researchers at the University of Michigan traced the impact of the 1977 Gordon College conference on the fifty-three participating institutions. Related dissertation research by Dr. Karen Longman of Michigan's Center for the Study of Higher Education focused on the dynamics of each state of the innovation process in those institutions, using a conceptual framework developed by Eveland, Rogers, and Lkepper (1977).

One stage of the Eveland/Rogers process calls for redefining the innovation to suit specific organizational conditions and needs. Twenty of the fifty-three institutions represented at the conference reported that a growth contracting related innovation had emerged as a result of the Gordon College dissemination effort.

Of these twenty respondents, six applied many elements of the Gordon model, but made some modifications. Five of these six institutions were Christian liberal arts colleges. While still following the Gordon model, nine other respondents made these major modifications:

1. Several of the respondents felt that the term *growth contracting* had a legalistic, binding connotation. Only four institutions used the term *growth contracting*, eight had accepted *individual development plans*. Terms such as *growth plans*, *faculty evaluation plans*, and *personal assessment* were also created.
2. Adopting institutions tended to simplify the model, frequently elimenating long-range goal setting. Only three called for long-range written plans similar to the Gordon model.

3. Few institutions required the use of an evaluation (advisory) committee. In fifteen of the twenty growth contracting-related innovations, faculty worked with department chairpersons, deans, or division directors rather than a selected committee of peers.

The concept of annual goal setting appeared to be most closely associated with *growth contracting* in the minds of conference participants. According to respondents, nineteen of the twenty innovations which had been influences by the Gordon model involved the use of annual plans.

While the Gordon College model was not duplicated by all institutions, it was found to be particularly well suited to small liberal arts colleges, and overall has proven to be adaptable across institutional types.

PROGRAM EVALUATION: UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN TEAM

From 1978-80, another research team from the University of Michigan, Center for the Study of Higher Education, led by Dr. Robert T. Blackburn, undertook a study of faculty developement programs in twenty-four institutions throughout the United States. Gordon College was included in this sample. According to the final report 'Project for Faculty Development Program Evaluation' (June, 1980) the project had three major thrusts: to develop assessment instruments for judging the success of faculty development programs; to provide formative and summative evaluation for the programs of the twenty-four participating institutions; and to explore the effectiveness of a number of strategies aimed at faculty growth in a variety of institutional settings.

"The University of Michigan team concluded, "Gordon faculty are obviously very satisfied with their affiliation with the College. The significantly higher percentage of Gordon faculty indicated that it was a good place for them to be."

The report goes on to point out, however, that over half the faculty said that they had difficulty giving their work the time it deserved, and almost two-thirds reported some job strain. Gordon faculty expressed a desire to teach less and spend less time in service while committing more time to areas of scholarship. The researchers concluded that Gordon faculty are tradtitional in the ways they conduct their scholarship, that they are more likely than colleagues at other institutions to write, and are somewhat less likely to engage in activities related to innovative teaching.

According to the results of the research, Gordon College faculty see the institution's reward structure as favoring good classroom teaching much more that do other institutions similar to Gordon. In general, the researchers concluded that there is a pattern of strong emphasis on classroom teaching at Gordon College with somewhat lower emphasis on innovative teaching and curriculum revision. They suggested this indicates a relatively stable curriculum.

The University of Michigan study is primarily an assessment of the impact which faculty development programs have in general on the traditional role of the faculty member. The study is not an evaluation of the Gordon College model nor does it attempt to indicate whether the purposes of the Gordon model are, in fact, being carried out.

This information is much more likely to be found in the research conducted by Dr. Jane Milley.

Bibliographic Information

"Evaluation Report for Gordon College," Robert T. Blackburn, Project Director, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, June 1980. Funded in part by a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Bibliographic Data

Longman, Karen A., "Faculty Development in a Period of Retrenchment," unpublished preliminary doctoral examination, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan, 1978.

POSSIBLE FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO POSITIVE RESULTS

Evaluations of the program are generally positive and support continuation. Several factors contribute to this preliminary positive assessment.

1. The program is "faculty owned." Policy is set by the faculty through the Faculty Development Committee and decisions on the finding of plans are made by the committee. The administration facilitates the program but resists taking direct control.
2. The program was pilot tested first by the dean and several key faculty before being proposed to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and the total faculty.
3. The growth plan approach is not tied directly to the personnel decision making process. While information is generated by the program which is voluntarily placed in personnel files by faculty,

no one is coerced into making this crossover. Development is paramount. Evaluation is a secondary by-product.

4. Individual faculty control the direction and thrust of their development. The content of growth is decided by each participant, not by a central committee or administrator. Growth goals are based on an individual's assessment of his/her strengths, weaknesses, and long-range projection of professional direction.
5. External funding obviously contrubuted to the high participation rate early in the program. Since faculty plans are funded on the annual average of $650 to $750 per person, much could be accomplished which would have gone undone without foundation support initially. However, it is important to note that although W.K. Kellogg Foundation support has been exhausted, the program now enjoys internal institutional funding at the same level of experience in prior years.
6. Individual support and excitement for the program is contagious. As faculty feel good about their faculty development accomplishments, they tend to stimulate others to join the program. Thus, the participation rate continues to be high--83% in 1980 just when the Faculty Development Committee expected a slight decline. Of the current faculty on campus since 1976, 100% have participated in the program for at least one year.
7. The individual development approach at Gordon is supportive, not critical. Faculty identify the colleagues they wish to have serve on their

advisory committees. The thrust is professional growth. Overall professional evaluation is assigned to the Faculty Senate.

8. Since accountability has become a watchword in higher education, the demand to define what a faculty member does outside of the classroom has mounted. An Individual Development Plan provides a structure which generates concrete evidence that a productive professional life exists. Fuzz is blowing away; the picture becomes focused.

BUDGET

Under the terms of the Kellogg grant, this program was to run for six years with a total budget of $350,000. Approximately 36.5% of the budget is supported by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and 63.5% by Gordon College. Kellogg funds were available for the first four years with Gordon sustaining the program entirely in its last two years.

Most of the funding is designated to support individual development of growth plans. Some is for replacing faculty who are awarded sabbaticals during which they complete their growth plans. A relatively small amount of the total budget covers one-fifth of the project director's salary, a half-time secretary, and office supplies directly related to the project.

EVALUATOR"S COMMENTS

Provided below are selected excerpts from the evaluator's report, "A Case Study Approach to the Evaluation of a Faculty Development Program Which Uses Individual Development Plans" (Jane Milley, Syracuse University, 1977).
Pages 119-120

The uniqueness of the Gordon College faculty development program.

"The research in the area of faculty development argues that there have been three primary models used in faculty development: (1) instructional development programs that focus on how courses are designed; (2) faculty development programs that focus on the development of faculty as persons or professionals; and (3) organizational development of policies and procedures that support the improvement of teaching. Recently, a publication entitled Faculty Development in Southern Universities (1976) reported that the types of activities that were typically chosen by institutions to implement these models of faculty development were:

Faculty Development	Seminars Workshops Teaching Evaluation
Instructional Development	Projects to produce new learning materials or redesign courses; workshops on writing objectives, evaluating students
Organizational Development	Workshops for group leaders or team members, action research with work groups, task forces to revise organizational policies (p.6)

"Gordon College was not approaching faculty development in any of these ways. The people I interviewed kept talking about vitality, helping faculty grow, improving dialogue, exploring new ideas, ensuring accountability, providing money, motivating faculty. These words were similar to those I had heard when other faculty development programs were discussed. The people I interviewed, however, were genuinely excited about the program -- they know that there were problems that needed to be worked out, but they believed that this program was working for Gordon College. Most of the participants that expressed an opinion during the March 14-18 interviews felt that the program was a success because it gave faculty a push to do things they might not ordinarily initiate. The primary motivation seemed to be money, along with a commitment to accomplish what was written down in I.D.P.s. Many, however, said that the actual writing of I.D.P.s was tedious and time consuming and they weren't sure that the money they received was worth the effort. What seemed to be different about the Gordon College program and also to be contributing to the enthusiasm of program participants was that faculty were asked, 'What do you want to do to continue your own development? How will this contribute to the institution; and how can we evaluate you achievements?'"

Pages 192-193

"Although I said I would not offer my own opinion directly about the success of the faculty development program I feel an obligation to respond to one faculty member who said 'I will feel cheated if her final report does not contain her own personal critique of the Gordon program.' Although I also do not know if the program has been a success, to date, it seems that the I.D.P. program

has been positively received by participants and others in the Gordon College community. Even though I have reported contradictory points of view during this case study, there is an overarching optimism that pervades even those reports that are negative. I think we have identified areas that need to be improved, and I believe that in some instances there has already been improvement. I am, however, personally concerned about how the level of commitment, time and expenditure of energy can be sustained by the FDC, the dean and I.D.P. participants. In conclusion, this evaluation is only a beginning and I believe that at some point Gordon College will need to be really concerned with how this program enhances student learning, what specific gains faculty make, and how the vitality of the program will be retained in the future."

GORDON
COLLEGE

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT MANUAL

18

PROGRAM DIRECTOR

Dr. R. Judson Carlberg
Dean of the Faculty

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Dr. Virginia Anderson
Associate Professor of German

Dr. Russell Camp
Associate Professor of Biology

Dr. Kaye Cook
Assistant Professor of Psychology

Dr. James Garvin
Associate Professor of Education

Mr. R. Stanford Terhune
Assistant Professor of Bibliography

Third Edition 1981

I. INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

Gordon College is committing itself to a program of faculty-administration growth at a significant time in the development of the institution. In recent years quantitative and qualitative growth have characterized the development of several aspects of the college's program. Principally the academic program has been strengthened through curricular reform and expansion and through the development of a faculty of potentially distinctive quality. At this stage in the life of the college it is appropriate to establish as an issue of high priority the qualitative growth of both faculty and administration.

There are several factors which compel educators to emphasize faculty development:

1. The economic depression in higher education has reduced faculty mobility and turnover which has always been a source of new ideas and fresh perspectives for colleges and universities. Increasingly, methodological

and ideological ferment must be internally generated from relatively stable faculties through development programs.

2. Given the relatively steady-state condition into which higher education has recently emerged, it is essential that colleges and universities continue to experience a climate of expectancy, a sense of movement and vigor that come from qualitative growth and accomplishment of mission. The faculty is the primary ingredient in building this institutional ethos.

3. A higher level of expected performance and accountability is being thrust upon institutions of higher learning. A program of faculty-administration development, having its own internal integrity based upon individual and peer review and evaluation, is an appropriate response to this expectation.

4. Personal and institutional experimentation and innovation which is essential to institutional development is encouraged and legitimized by a program which emphasizes individualized growth.

5. A properly conceived program of individualized development can provide a sound basis for evaluation and improvement in personnel decisions.

B. DEFINITION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

1. DEAN OF THE FACULTY. This program is to be administered by the dean of the faculty who will devote approximately twenty percent of his time to program administration. A significant portion of his involvement will consist of conferences with each participant at the early state of long-range planning (see profile conference under Section II, b).

2. DIVISION/DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN. Division and department chairmen will participate in individual profile conferences as requested.

3. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE. The Faculty Development Committee (hereafter referred to as FDC) will consist of one faculty representative from each of the academic divisions. Election to this committee will normally be for three years. Committee membership will be staggered to maintain a good mix of new and experienced members. The major areas of responsibility delegated to the FDC by the dean are:

a. to discuss and to make recommendations on matters of policy relating to the faculty development program.

b. to review and to advise in the design of individual development plans, and to approve the final drafts.

c. to advise in the selection of advisory committees for individual development plans.

d. to approve budget requests within budgetary limits for individual development

plans, to make recommendations regarding requests for additional funds or for reallocations, and to ensure full expenditure of grant funds by the end of each fiscal year.

e. to maintain sufficient records to make possible a thorough evaluation of the program.

As a faculty committee, the FDC also has these added responsibilities:

a. to review and to make recommendations concerning all faculty sabbatical requests.

b. to plan and to oversee the annual fall faculty workshop.

4. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY. A half-time secretary will be assigned to the FDC to handle committee work. Secretarial help in support of Individual Development Plan activities should either be sought from the departmental secretarial staff, or included as a budget line item in those plans, in which case the responsibility for procuring such help will rest with the individual participant.

5. ADVISORY COMMITTEE. The major responsibilities of an advisory committee are:

a. to review the first draft plans along with the FDC suggestions, and to advise the participant in the design of the final draft of his plan.

b. to meet with the participant to support and to monitor the progress of the faculty member as he carries out his plan.

c. to review the participant's self-assessment and the evidence he has produced, and

to give him a written consensus evaluation of his growth as a result of his plan. (Also, see Appendix IV.)

6. PARTICIPANTS. Participation is on a voluntary basis, and is open to full-time faculty and selected administrative officers. The major responsibilities of each participant are:

a. to design an individual profile as a long-range framework for proposed action, and to confer on this profile with the dean of the faculty.

b. to design an annual Individual Development Plan on the basis of his long-range profile.

c. to satisfy the self-imposed requirements of his plan.

d. to assess, together with his advisory committee, personal growth resulting from action taken under his plan.

e. to keep a ledger account of funds spent and provide documentation of expenditures.

f. to submit assessments and financial records to the FDC at the end of the plan. (This information will be used by the FDC for purposes of evaluating total program effectiveness. Any other use of the plan and its outcome is totally at the discretion of the participant.)

II. PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

A. TABLE OF PROCEDURES

The following table outlines the nine major steps that are the responsibility of the participant.

with an indication of deadline dates. Detailed instructions for each step are given in Section II, B.

STEP ONE — Preparation of Individual Profile

Self Assessment
Statement of Current Roles
Long-Range Goals
Synthesis

STEP TWO — Profile Conference

STEP THREE — Preparation of First Draft of Annual Individual Development Plan

Review of Principles and Policies
Goals
Means of Accomplishment
Means of Assessment
Budget Proposal
Advisory Committee Proposal

STEP FOUR — Submission of Profile and First Draft of Annual Plan to FDC

(DEADLINE: FIRST MONDAY IN MARCH)

FDC ACTION
Review all Plans
Make Initial Budget Projections
Comment letters to Participants

(DEADLINE: LAST MONDAY IN MARCH)

STEP FIVE — Preparation of Final Draft of Annual Plan

Make Final Selection of Advisory Committee

Advisory Committee Review Profile, Plan, and FDC Comments

STEP SIX — Submission of Final Draft of Annual Plan to FDC

(DEADLINE: THIRD MONDAY IN APRIL)

FDC ACTION

Review all Plans

Final Action

Prepare Budget, Ledgers, and Allocation Letters

Distribute

(DEADLINE: FIRST MONDAY IN MAY)

STEP SEVEN — Carrying Out of Annual Plan

Interact with Advisory Committee

Request Budget Changes as Appropriate

Have all Allocated Funds Committed by May 1 of the Plan Year

FDC ACTION

Periodic Review of Budget Status

Redistribution of Funds

Distribute Evaluation Forms

STEP EIGHT — Assesment of Growth

Self-Assessment

Advisory Committee Assessment

STEP NINE Submission of Final Reports to FDC

Self and Advisory Committee Evaluations with Evidence
Budget Ledger
Financial Documentation

(DEADLINE: JULY 1 FOLLOWING END OF PLAN YEAR)

FDC ACTION
Review Evaluations
Close Annual Budget
Summary Report to Dean of Faculty

B. INSTRUCTIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS

The following pages give detailed instructions for each of the nine steps outlined above. Plans begin on July 1 and end June 30.

STEP ONE PREPARATION OF INDIVIDUAL PROFILE

a. PURPOSE OF THE INDIVIDUAL PROFILE

The individual profile is an outline of the individual's long-range planning that will be the basis of a series of annual growth contracts. The components of this profile will be a written assessment of strengths and weaknesses, a statement of current roles, a statement of long-range goals, and a synthesis of these elements into a long-range proposal. This profile is designed to be of assistance in the following three ways:

TO THE INDIVIDUAL: Beyond simply being a stimulus for thorough planning, the profile is the mechanism whereby each participant can present

the long-range view behind his specific annual plan. Since the Individual Development Plans are of necessity limited to the proposed activities of a given year, this profile is the opportunity to share the larger context in which the annual plans should be seen.

TO THE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: The principle of systematic planning suggests that all annual plans proceed from the larger context of long-range planning, and that there be coherence in the series of annual plans that proceed from the profile. The profile will thus help the committee in its assessment of annual plans.

TO THE INSTITUTION: In the larger context of long-range planning significant changes such as a major redefinition of personal role are more clearly outlined. The readiness of the institution to provide for such change is a key issue for meaningful faculty development, and the identification of these changes as well as the process of accommodation to them is best begun early in the program. The profile and conference are the mechanism to this end.

The scope of information to be included in the profile is left to the discretion of each applicant, with the suggestion that it be limited to that which he would feel comfortable in defending as significantly related to his own professional development.

b. INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL PROFILE

It may be helpful while going through the following instructions to refer to the profile format outline

given as a fold-out sheet on the first page of Appendix I. You may also want to refer to Appendix I itself which is a sample completed profile.

1. SELF ASSESSMENT

Write a frank assessment of your strengths and current interests as well as your weaknesses and current dislikes. Include items directly related to your current institutional responsibilities (e.g., an ability to conduct small seminars in contrast to a lack of ability in lecturing to large classes, or an interest in doing more research in contrast to a distaste for the administrative duties of being a department head). Also include items that may be related only indirectly to current institutional responsibilities (e.g., lack of aesthetic sensitivity in contrast to an ability for critical thinking, an interest in further study outside of your discipline, or a need to devote more time to your family).

2. STATEMENT OF CURRENT ROLES

a. Institutional Responsibilities.

Write a statement of your current institutional responsibilities based on the assignments actually carried out during the past few quarters. This statement ought to be comprehensive, including such items as specific teaching duties, scholarly activities, counseling, committee work, administrative work, advising student organizations, athletic coaching, and small chapel group involvement.

b. Other Major Responsibilities.

Write a statement of extra-institutional responsibilities which you consider to have significant rights to your time or which relate to your concept of personal development. This statement ought to include such items as interim pastorates or other major church involvement, civic responsibilities, leadership in professional organizations, family time commitment, and the like.

3. LONG RANGE PROJECTIONS

Write a statement projecting future (typically two to five years) roles and responsibilities you would like to fill. Do you see new directions that might alter your current roles? Do you see improvement in current areas of responsibility?

4. SYNTHESIS

a. Assessment of Current Responsibilities.

Write an assessment of your current responsibilities in the light of your stated strengths and weaknesses and of your long-range projections. To what extent are they compatible?

b. Definition of Responsibilities During The Period Covered by this Profile.

Write a statement that outlines your proposed responsibilities during the long-range projection period. Give a rough outline in yearly blocks of how you hope to develop over this period. Are there special roles relating to these projects which may

imply the need for departmental or colleague accommodation? Are major redefinitions of your institutional roles involved? Are other changes implied that will necessitate dialogue with those responsible for institutional planning? This statement should define the larger context out of which the specific annual plans will proceed.

The profile is not meant for annual rewrite and submission. It will depend on the length of projections made and the progress of the faculty member as to when he may want to update this profile. The profile document will be held in the participant's faculty development file for the duration of his participation in the program. Only the Individual Development Plan need be drafted and submitted annually.

STEP TWO PROFILE CONFERENCE

The faculty member should provide a copy of the completed profile to the dean of the faculty and department/division chairmen as appropriate, and should then schedule a conference with the dean to consider its major issues. The aim of the conference is threefold:

1. to support the faculty member in his effort to promote his own professional development;
2. to inform the academic leadership as to the plans and efforts of individual faculty members; and
3. to initiate necessary dialog and institutional action toward allowing for major changes or redefinitions of role.

It is not necessary that the conference have been conducted before proceding to step three. It is left to the judgment of the faculty member as to the likelihood that the conference will substantially alter his annual plan. For purposes of the FDC, it is necessary only that the conference have been conducted prior to the submission of the profile and final draft of the annual plan in step six.

STEP THREE PREPARATION OF FIRST DRAFT OF ANNUAL INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

a. REVIEW OF PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES

When writing the first draft of your annual development plan, keep in mind the following guidelines that will be used by the FDC in screening proposed plans.

1. Specific goals should follow from the projections of the profile and should relate to the consideration of strengths, weaknesses, and roles outlined in the profile.
2. There should be an adequate description of the means by which each goal will be accomplished.
3. Goals should appear to be attainable within the prescribed period of time.
4. There should be a clear statement of the evidence that will be produced for evaluating the extent of attainment of each goal.
5. Each goal should reflect a demonstratable contribution to one or more of the following emphases:
    a. strengthening Gordon as an institution for Christian higher education;
    b. developing students; and
    c. disciplinary or interdisciplinary scholarship.

6. Purely personal objectives are a valuable part of individual growth and are appropriate for inclusion in an annual plan, but as a matter of propriety are not eligible for grant funding. Funds will not be granted for faculty meals in the campus dining room.

7. Supportive evidence should be provided demonstrating that each member of the proposed advisory committee can make a significant contribution to at least one of the following areas:

   a. designing of the annual plan,
   b. implementation of the plan, and
   c. evaluation.

8. Individual Development Plans containing goals proposed for accomplishment during a sabbatical leave must be clearly labeled as sabbatical plans, even if non-sabbatical goals are included in the plan as well. Sabbatical plans are subject to the same FDC screening and criteria as non-sabbatical plans.

9. There must be a direct relationship between each budget item and a stated goal.

10. Stipend, salary, or other direct personal remuneration to the participant or to members of his immediate family, even for services rendered, will not be funded.

11. It is expected that the participant will collect receipts, invoices, and the like as documentation for each expenditure, insofar as this can reasonably be done.

12. FDC and I.D.P. files will be closed to all but the FDC and individual participants. Access to individual files by any others is only by permission of the participants involved.

13. Purchase of equipment and books can be legitimate if related to specific goals. All equipment and books purchased under this program are the property of Gordon College and must remain at the College. Budget requests related to items that are not integrally associated with individual development (e.g., appear more to benefit departmental budgets) will be given low funding priority. Equipment and other items normally purchased through college budgets cannot be funded under this program.

14. Travel to professional meetings does not in and of itself constitute an acceptable goal. Such travel is more properly a means of accomplishment and must relate directly to a stated goal in order to be eligible for funding.

Requests for conference travel will be given the following funding priorities.

a. Conferences on a closely-defined topic relating to an I.D.P. goal and conferences in which the participant is presenting a paper will be given higher priority.

b. Conferences requested pursuant to a goal of "general professional updating" will be given lower priority.

15. The FDC has set the following limits for travel expense.

a. Regardless of the mode of travel, transportation funding will not exceed a maximum equal to economy airfare, round-trip for the destination involved.

b. All expenses billed to the College under this program must be at actual cost subject to the limits set in items (c) and (d).

c. Food costs will not be funded in excess of $20 per day.

Lodging costs will not be funded in excess of $40 per day.

d. For each travel request, total food and lodging may not exceed a figure equal to five days at the above limits.

16. Remuneration for student assistants will be eligible for funding only if the duties of said assistants are directly related to the activities contained in the annual plan (e.g., monies will not be provided for assistants whose principle functions are simply to free the applicant from his current responsibilities).

17. FDC funds will not be granted for an individual faculty member's expenses incurred on course field trips in which students are taking work for credit.

b. INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: ANNUAL APPLICATION

On the basis of your global plans given in the profile, design your own plan for personal and professional growth in the upcoming academic year. Annual applications for development plans should follow the format given below. It may be helpful to refer to the I.D.P. format outline, given as a fold-out sheet on the first page of Appendix II, while going through the following instructions. You may also want to refer to Appendix II itself which gives a full complement of samples in a sample completed I.D.P.

1. DURATION OF PLAN

Using a separate covering sheet, indicate your name, department, and the academic year for which the current plan is being designed (e.g., July1-June 30).

2. SCOPE OF PLAN IN RELATION TO FACULTY PROFILE

The purpose of your faculty profile is to give direction and coherence to your personal development over a long-range period (typically two to five years). During this period you may choose to design a number of plans, each of which is to be of one year's duration.

State in this section the relationship between the development plan you are now designing and your long-range profile. Which particular aspects of your profile are you emphasizing in this current plan? For example, if your profile suggests multiple areas of future development, which areas will you be dealing with this coming year? Or if your profile calls for a long-range program of personal study or for an eventual major change in institutional role, what steps will you be taking this coming year?

3. INDIVIDUAL PLAN FOR GROWTH

The basic components of your growth plan will consist of your statements of personal goals, means for accomplishing these goals, means for assessing the extent and quality of goal accomplishment, and budget requests related to the various means of accomplishment.

You may design as many goals as you judge to be attainable within a one year period. Some of your goals may be simple in the sense that you specify one means for accomplishment, one means for assessment, and one budget request. The outline for

stating such goals should be as follows:

Goal A
- Means of Accomplishment
- Means of Assessment
- Budget Request

Goal B
- Means of Accomplishment
- Means of Assessment
- Budget Request

On the other hand, some of your goals may be complex, with each goal corresponding to multiple means of accomplishment as well as multiple means of assessment. The outline for stating such goals should be as follows:

Goal A
- Means of Accomplishment (1)
  - Means of Assessment (1)
  - Means of Assessment (2)
  - Budget Request
- Means of Accomplishment (2)
  - Means of Assessment (1)
  - Means of Assessment (2)
  - Budget Request
- Means of Accomplishment (3), Etc.

Goal B, Etc.

Whether your goals are simple or complex, the instructions for each of the above categories are as follows:

a. Goal Statement

State a particular goal that you wish to accomplish this coming year. Avoid vagueness and generalities.

A well-stated goal is specific enough to suggest means for accomplishment. A goal should also be measurable in the sense that it suggests means and criteria for assessing the extent and quality of accomplishment. For example, the goal "*to excel in teaching*" is too vague and general to suggest either means for accomplishment or means for assessing accomplishment. In contrast, the following variation of this goal is an improvement:

> *To ascertain student and colleague opinion on the effectiveness of my teaching in introductory courses in Mathematics.*

Obviously the latter goal statement is not as global as the originally conceived goal. It can be seen as a first step in implementing the desire for excellence in teaching. It is specific enough to suggest means for accomplishment and means for assessing accomplishment. Furthermore, once accomplished, this goal provides the basis for additional goals that can be part of a later development plan (e.g., "To initiate corrective measures in areas where student and colleague opinion indicates need for improvement in teaching").

b. Means of Accomplishment

Describe the step or steps that you will take during the year to accomplish your stated goal. Be as specific as possible. For example, relative to the above goal on ascertaining teaching effectiveness, the means of accomplishment should

not merely be a paraphrasing of the goal statement. Rather, it should indicate a clear procedure as follows:

Means of Accomplishment (1)

At the completion of my 1977 courses in The Nature of Mathematics (M 103) and Precalculus Mathematics (M 113), all students will be asked to complete the standard college evaluation form on teaching effectiveness.

Means of Accomplishment (2)

Dr. Jones of the Math Department will be asked to sit in on three consecutive sessions of both M 103 and M 113, and to prepare a written statement on observed strengths and weaknesses.

Means of Accomplishment (3)

After discussion with Dr. Jones relative to student opinions as well as his opinions on my teaching effectiveness, I will prepare a written statement describing areas where I now see the need for improvement, with an indication of possible corrective measures in areas of weakness.

Note that the third means of accomplishment provides a possible transition between the present goal and a future goal of initiating corrective measures.

c. Means of Assessment

For each step under means of accomplishment, indicate the basis on which your advisory committee will judge the extent to which you have accomplished this step. Include reference to all evidence that you will place in the hands of your committee. If deemed

appropriate, you may even suggest the criteria you believe your committee should use in judging your accomplishment. The more specific you can be, the easier will be the assessment task of your committee. For example, relative to *Means of Accomplishment (1)* noted above, asking students to complete course evaluation forms, the means of assessment could read as follows:

> *My Advisory Committee will be presented with a quantitative summary of the results of the numeral ratings on the evaluation forms, as well as an exhaustive listing of all written comments.*

d. Budget Request

When requesting funds, every budget request ought to appear under the particular means of accomplishment requiring funding. Wherever possible, there should be a breakdown of the various components comprising a given budget request.

For example, if one means of accomplishing a given goal involves attendance at a professional conference, then the funds requested for this conference should be listed under this means, and should be broken down into such items as air fare, registration fees, living accommodations, and meals.

The above instructions for writing goal statements, means of accomplishment, means of assessment, and budget request should be used for each goal in your development plan.

4. PROPOSED ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Select an advisory committee of persons whom you judge to be especially suited to assisting you in the design and implementation of your plan and in the evaluation of your growth. Obviously, the committee should be chosen in light of your particular goals for the year. Potential committee members may include faculty colleagues, administrators, students, alumni, or colleagues at other institutions. You should seek the consent of all proposed members. The number of members is optional.

For each proposed committee member, indicate the particular contribution that you anticipate he or she will make to your development plan. For example, the choice of Dr. Jones relative to the above goal on teaching effectiveness could be supported as follows:

> *Dr. Jones has a reputation for excellence in the teaching of mathematics, especially for lower-level courses for non-majors. Therefore, he should be particularly helpful as I seek to ascertain my teaching effectiveness in M 103 and M 113.*

5. PROCEDURES FOR MONITORING PROGRESS

This section should not be completed at this time since your choice of advisory committee has not yet been reviewed. Complete this section when you write the final draft of this plan (instructions for completion are included at the end of step 5).

6. SUMMARY OF BUDGET REQUESTS

Present a detailed tabular summary of all budget requests made under this development plan. In order to maintain

uniform accounting procedures, use a separate sheet of paper for this summary, and follow the format presented in the sample development plan in Appendix II.

If you will be making use of a sabbatical leave to accomplish any portion of your annual plan, then check the line designated as "Leave of Absence Fund." Otherwise, check "Individualized Development Fund."

STEP FOUR SUBMISSION OF PROFILE AND FIRST DRAFT OF ANNUAL PLAN TO FDC

Submit two copies of both your faculty profile and the first draft of your annual development plan to the FDC secretary by the first Monday in March.

Your profile and annual plan will be assigned to two of your colleagues on the FDC who will be responsible for evaluating your input in light of the principles and policies previously noted (see section a under Step Three). One of these FDC members will be assigned the responsibility of preparing a written response to you containing comments and possible suggestions for improving your proposed annual plan. You should receive this response by the last Monday in March. From this point in time, the responding faculty member will be your liaison with the FDC, and all ensuing questions concerning your plan should be directed to him or her.

STEP FIVE PREPARATION OF FINAL DRAFT OF ANNUAL PLAN

Finalize your choice of an advisory committee, taking into account any suggestions the FDC may have made concerning the make-up of this committee.

Send copies of the following items to each member of your final advisory committee: your Faculty Profile; your Annual Development Plan; the written response received from your FDC liaison; a written statement on your part indicating the changes you anticipate making in your Development Plan, if any, on the basis of the FDC response.

You should agree with your A.C. upon procedures for monitoring your progress relative to your final plan. These procedures may include regular meetings as a committee, less structured consultation on a one-to-one basis, correspondence with adjunct members off campus, or whatever other methods facilitate the completion and assessment of your goals. As an example, the following monitoring procedures are abstracted from the sample Annual Plan contained in Appendix II.

PROCEDURES FOR MONITORING PROGRESS

A. Informal consultation with appropriate A.C. members as the need arises during the year.

B. Meetings with my entire A.C. to discuss progress: first week in April, first week in June.

C. Written progress report to my A.C. and subsequent meeting with entire committee: first week in September.

D. Final report of self-assessment to my A.C. and subsequent meeting with entire committee in preparation for their assessment: second week in December.

After discussion with your Advisory Committee, prepare a final draft of your Annual Plan, including procedures for monitoring progress.

STEP SIX SUBMISSION OF FINAL DRAFT OF ANNUAL PLAN TO FDC

Submit the final draft of your annual development Plan to the FDC secretary on the third Monday in April.

a. FDC ACTION

The FDC member responsible for your annual plan will evaluate your final draft in light of the previously noted comments and suggestions for improving your first draft (see Step Four). This committee member will then come to the entire FDC with one of the following recommendations: approve the entire plan including total budget request; approve the plan subject to certain contingencies and/or reductions in requested budget; or return to participant for revision.

The FDC will act as a body on all plans. Each participating faculty member will be notified in writing of the decision of the FDC by the first Monday in May.

STEP SEVEN CARRYING OUT OF ANNUAL PLAN

After your annual plan has been approved and funds have been made available, you will be working toward the accomplishment of your stated goals. During this period you ought to meet with your advisory committee according to the schedule agreed upon. Any questions that arise concerning procedure should be directed to the faculty member who is serving as your FDC liaison.

a. FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION

Each participant who has been awarded funds by the FDC will receive with their letter of notification a budget

allocation form (75-1075A) and a simple declining balance ledger sheet. (See Appendix II for copies of these forms as completed for the sample Annual Plan contained in Appendix II.) Upon receipt of these documents, the participant is free to expend funds for his plan, under the following guidelines:

1. All expenditures of I.D.P. funds should be made through the college's purchase and accounting system. Check requisitions, purchase orders, student time sheets, and other standard means of purchase should be handled directly with the Business Office. It is the participant's responsibility to ensure that all charges be correctly identified by his I.D.P. account number. This is particularly true of the more "indirect" means of charging such as xerox work, or bills from outside travel agencies whom you have contacted directly.

   The college is under the same obligation to provide a clear audit trail for I.D.P. funds as for regular college funds. It is important, therefore, that documentation be provided for all expenditures. In the case of money drawn in advance, the participant is responsible to forward expense documents to the Business Office as soon as they become available.

2. The primary accounting for I.D.P. funds expended by individual cost categories will be done by each participant on the declining balance ledger sheets provided. Each ledger sheet will have been pre-labeled

by cost category before it is distributed to the participant. A completed sample is given in Appendix III. These sheets must be returned to the FDC with the final evaluations and should reflect the entire financial history of that account for the academic year (including all expenditures, transfers between categories, additional funds granted, funds returned for redistribution, etc.).

The business office will keep a ledger for each account as well, but their ledger will only reflect the single figure of total account expenditure to date. They may send a copy of their ledger sheet to each participant periodically so that a cross check can be made.

Each participant is responsible to see that his entire account is committed by May 1, and that his ledger balance is zero by June 30.

3. The participant is authorized to transfer funds between existing cost categories up to a total limit of $50 at his own discretion. Requests for transfers in excess of $50, for establishing new cost categories, or for additional funds should be sent in memorandum form to the FDC. If it becomes apparent that allocated funds will not be expended, they should be returned at the earliest possible date to the FDC for redistribution to other participants.

STEP EIGHT ASSESSMENT OF GROWTH

a. SELF ASSESSMENT

Toward the end of the academic year, each participant will receive two sets of evaluation forms keyed to the goals of his current year plan (see sample given in Appendix III). After a review of your goals, the stated means of assessment, and the evidence generated during the implementation of your plan, fill out the rating scale and comments of one set of the forms as a self-evaluation.

It is an assumed principle of the program that time taken for a thorough review and evaluation is a significant ingredient in the matter of individual growth. You are encouraged to make these forms a meaningful part of your development effort.

b. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ASSESSMENT

It is the responsibility of each participant to share his self-evaluation and evidence with his advisory committee and to provide them with the second set of evaluation forms. The advisory committee should review your evidence as well as the assessment guidelines given as Appendix IV, and return their completed evaluations to you for your review.

The advisory committee is likewise encouraged to proceed on the assumption that an honest and thorough assessment is in the best interest of the participant's development.

STEP NINE SUBMISSION OF FINAL REPORT TO FDC

Return both sets of evaluations forms, along with your completed ledger and any evidence you wish to have placed in your files, to the FDC secretary by July 1.

At this point the FDC files will contain the following documents for each participant:

Faculty Profile
First Draft of I.D.P.
FDC Response to the First Draft
Final Draft of I.D.P.
Budget Allocation Form
Completed Self-Assessment
Completed Advisory Committee Assessment
Completed Ledger Sheet
Other Correspondence, Changes, Etc.

These files will remain intact until either the participant requests in writing the receipt of any or all of these documents, or until the material is returned to you.

It is the option of the participating faculty member to file copies of any of these documents in his current dossier in the office of the academic dean.

I. SELF-ASSESSMENT

A. STRENGTHS AND INTERESTS

1. I derive immense satisfaction from my teaching activities. My teaching strength lies in the area of upper-level courses for math majors. Since my training is in pure mathematics, I feel most comfortable and have the greatest success when teaching courses that emphasize an axiomatic approach.
2. I am interested in expanding on my doctoral research in the area of topology. I believe I have the ability to produce research articles on a regular basis.
3. I believe that I have the ability to relate well to students both in and out of class.
4. I have recently developed a keen interest in the applications of mathematics to the social sciences, especially in the area of operations research.
5. I have recently become interested in the study of ethics. This interest has developed primarily from a series of informal discussions with students who have been struggling with a variety of major ethical decisions, and the feeling on my part that I have been of little help to them. I also view this study outside of my area of specialization as having a broadening effect on my own development.

B. WEAKNESSES AND CURRENT DISLIKES

1. I am rather ineffective in teaching core curriculum math courses to non-majors. This

is probably due to a tendency to presuppose more math background than most students actually have. I have great difficulty hiding my impatience with students who have not mastered simple arithmetic operations.

2. I am not very effective in carrying out my administrative duties as chairman of the math department. I have a general dislike of these duties, and thus tend to put them off until well past deadline dates.

3. At present I know very little about the two areas of study in which I have recently developed interests, namely, ethics and the applications of mathematics to the social sciences.

II. CURRENT RESPONSIBILITIES

A. INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

1. I teach an average of three courses per quarter, consisting of upper-level courses for math majors as well as introductory courses for both math majors and non-majors.

2. I supervise an average of two guided studies per year for senior math majors planning on graduate study.

3. I serve on the Faculty Affairs Committee, which meets on a regular weekly basis, and the Faculty Scholarship Committee, which meets once or twice a year.

4. I serve as Faculty Advisor to twelve math majors and four freshmen who have not yet declared majors.

5. I serve as chairman of the Mathematics Department.
6. I serve on advisory committees for two faculty colleagues, H. Park and S. Stephens, in conjunction with their Individual Development Plans.

B. OTHER MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES
1. I serve as an assistant minister at Faith Congregational Church in Bartonsville, Massachusetts. My main responsibility is with the college age group.
2. I am an elected member of the local Board of Education in the town of Wenham.
3. I serve as the Regional Representative for the Mathematical Association of America.

III. LONG-RANGE PROJECTIONS
A. I would like to help our Math Department develop to the point where it is competitive with major universities in preparing students for graduate study.
B. In light of my recent interests in ethics and in the applications of mathematics to the social sciences, I would like to develop significant expertise in these areas over the course of the next three or four years.
C. I would like to be relieved of some of the constant pressure of administrative duties as department chairman.
D. I would like to devote more time to research in my specialization.

IV. SYNTHESIS

A. ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT RESPONSIBILITIES

For the most part I am fairly well satisfied with my current responsibilities, both institutional and otherwise. My committee and advisement responsibilities are normal, and I do not wish any significant changes. With regard to my teaching responsibilities, I recognize that I am not particularly suited to teaching lower level math courses to non-majors. However, since our department is small, I realize that I must share in this joint responsibility. I therefore need significant personal development in this area.

The areas where my strengths, interests and long-range projections are not compatible with my current responsibilities are as follows: too much of my time is taken up with administrative responsibilities; not enough of my time is devoted to research within my specialization; and I need to see that the department gives more attention to preparing our better students for graduate study.

B. DEFINITION OF RESPONSIBILITIES DURING THE PROFILE PERIOD

I anticipate that this present profile will be useful for the next three to four years. I neither expect nor desire any major changes in my role as advisor to students or in the magnitude of my committee responsibilities during this period.

I anticipate no significant change in the extent of my responsibility for teaching core curriculum math courses for non-majors, but I hope to significantly improve my performance in this area, first by asking students and colleagues to help me identify my weaknesses and then by taking specific steps to rectify weaknesses.

In light of my strengths and interests, I would like to project the following changes in my current responsibilities during this profile period:

1. Since I consider myself to be a poor administrator, I would like to rotate this responsibility with my two math colleagues, each of whom I would judge to be at least as capable (or incapable) as I am in this area. I would suggest a two-year rotation, with my present term expiring in June of 1982.
2. If I am relieved of department chairman responsibilities by June 1982, then I would plan on offering more senior guided studies for majors preparing for graduate study. I believe I could handle approximately five guided studies per year starting in the fall of 1982, at least until I again become department chairman, perish the thought. If and when the department grows to four faculty members, some of the topics for these guided studies could be incorporated into the regular math curriculum. Such courses would make our students more competitive in their graduate study.

3. If I am relieved of my department chairman responsibilities, then I would also be able to devote more time to research. I believe I could then produce an average of two major research articles per year. However, even as department chairman, I plan to continue my present limited research activities.
4. I plan on pursuing a reading program dealing with applications of mathematics to the social sciences. I will begin this program during the next calendar year. Future directions for this study will have to evolve out of my experience the first year. I anticipate a continuing program of approximately three years duration.
5. Since my training has been in the more abstract portion of mathematics, my teaching assignments in upper-level courses are rightfully limited to these areas. As I seek to gain further expertise in the applications of mathematics to the social sciences, I would eventually like to have the opportunity to teach courses in this new area. A new course in operations research may one day be a suitable way to accomplish this desire.
6. I plan on taking a series of ethics courses at Gordon and at neighboring institutions over the next two to three years. During the first year, I will audit the two ethics courses offered by our own philosophy department. I will then

consider taking additional courses at Gordon Conwell Seminary or at graduate schools in Boston.

7. After I feel that I have grappled sufficiently with some of the basic contemporary issues in ethics, I would like to be able to informally share some of the results of my study with my students. The Alternative Chapel Program may be a suitable vehicle for this a few years from now.

APPENDIX II

SAMPLE ANNUAL INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

ANNUAL INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Jack LaPlace

Department of Mathematics

Gordon College

July 1981 - June 1982

ANNUAL INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FORMAT OUTLINE

(For Reference Only)

I. SCOPE OF PLAN IN RELATION TO FACULTY PROFILE

II. INDIVIDUAL PLAN
- GOALS
- MEANS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT
- MEANS OF ASSESSMENT
- BUDGET REQUEST

(FORMAT VARIES, AS OUTLINED IN INSTRUCTIONS)

III. PROPOSED ADVISORY COMMITTEE

IV. PROCEDURES FOR MONITORING PROGRESS
(FINAL DRAFT ONLY)

V. SUMMARY OF BUDGET REQUESTS
(SEPARATE SHEET)

I. SCOPE OF PLAN IN RELATION TO FACULTY PROFILE

This plan emphasizes the following aspcts noted in my profile: the need to identify my weaknesses in teaching core curriculum math courses for non-majors, as a first step toward improving my effectiveness in these courses; and my desire to initiate studies in the areas of ethics and applied mathematics for the social sciences.

II. INDIVIDUAL PLAN FOR GROWTH

GOAL A: TO FAMILIARIZE MYSELF WITH THE MAJOR AREAS OF APPLICATION OF MATHEMATICS TO THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Means of Accomplishment (1):

I will complete an introductory level reading program on the applications of mathematics to the social sciences. This program will consist of the following books chosen on the basis of consultation with Dr. Smith of the Economics Department:

R. L. Childress. Mathematics for Managerial Decisions, Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1974.

A. C. Chaing. Fundamental Methods of Mathematical Economics, Second Edition, MyGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1975.

F. S. Hillier. Operations Research, Holden-Day, Inc., San Francisco, 1974.

D. M. Simmons. Linear Programming for Operations Research, Holden-Day, Inc., San Francisco, 1972.

Means of Assessment:

I will give my advisory committee a statement containing the following: an indication of the extent to which I accomplished the reading program outlined above; a summary of the major topics studied; and a projection of possible future directions in my continuing study next year.

Budget Request: Purchase of books $44.00.

Means of Accomplishment (2):

I will attend a summer 1981 conference on Mathematical Models in Economics sponsored by the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM).

Means of Assessment (1):

I will prepare a statement for my advisory committee that summarizes the major trends emerging from the conference.

Means of Assessment (2):

I will prepare a talk on major trends in mathematical modeling in economics, to be presented at a joint meeting of my advisory committee with the Division of Social Sciences and the Division of Natural Sciences annd Mathematics.

Budget Request:

(a) Round-trip air fare to Los Angeles	$375.00
(b) Registration fee	25.00
(c) Lodging (July 16-18)	90.00
(d) Meals	45.00
Total	$535.00

53

GOAL B: TO PREPARE ONE ARTICLE FOR PUBLICATION IN THE AREA OF TOPOLOGY

Means of Accomplishment:

I will complete the research for this article during the spring quarter, with the writing to be done during the summer. I hope to submit the article for publication by September, 1980

Means of Assessment:

If an article is accepted for publication, I will present it to my advisory committee. Otherwise, I will prepare a progress report.

Budget Request: Typing (approximately 20 pages at $ .75 per page) $15.00

GOAL C: TO ASCERTAIN STUDENT AND COLLEAGUE OPINION ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MY TEACHING OF INTRODUCTORY COURSES IN MATHEMATICS

Means of Accomplishment (1):

At the completion of my 1980 courses in The Nature of Mathematics (M 103) and Precalculus Mathematics (M113), all students will be asked to complete the standard college evaluation form on teaching effectiveness.

Means of Assessment:

My advisory committee will be presented with a quantitative summary of the results of the numerical ratings on the student evaluation forms, as well as an exhaustive listing of all written comments.

Budget Request: None

Means of Accomplishment (2):
Dr. Jones of the Math Department will be asked to sit in on three consecutive sessions of both M 103 and M 113, and to prepare a written statement on observed strengths and weaknesses.

Means of Assessment:
Dr. Jones' written comments will be presented to all members of my advisory committee. As a member of this committee, Dr. Jones will bear the major responsibility for interpreting these comments.

Budget Request: None

Means of Accomplishment (3):
After discussion with Dr. Jones relative to student opinion as well as his opinions on my teaching effectiveness, I will prepare a written statement describing areas where I see the need for improvement, with an indication of possible corrective measures in areas of weakness.

Means of Assessment:
My statement on possible corrective measures will be presented to my advisory committee for their comments.

Budget Request: None

GOAL D: TO OBTAIN A GLOBAL VIEW OF THE MAJOR CONTEMPORARY ISSUES IN NORMATIVE ETHICS AND META-ETHICS IN PREPARATION FOR MORE SPECIALIZED STUDY

Means of Accomplishment:
I will audit the following two courses taught at Gordon during the 1981-82 academic year: Ethical

Theories (Phil 213): and Seminar in Contemporary Ethics (Phil 493).

Means of Assessment (1):

My advisory committee will be presented with syllabi for these two courses, and an indication of the extent of my reading for these courses.

Means of Assessment (2):

I will prepare a statement for my advisory committee that identifies the major issues in normative ethics and meta-ethics that I would like to concentrate on in future studies, as well as my reasons for these choices.

Budget Request: Purchase of textbooks for Phil 213 and Phil 493. $25.50

III. PROPOSED ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A. DR. ROGER JONES

ANTICIPATED CONTRIBUTION: Dr. Jones has a reputation for excellence in the teaching of mathematics, especially for lower-level courses for non-majors. Therefore, he should be particularly helpful as I seek to ascertain my teaching effectiveness in M 103 and M 113. He will also be of some assistance relative to my math research project.

B. DR. FRANK SMITH

ANTICIPATED CONTRIBUTION: Dr. Smith is a social scientist who is very much interested in the applications of mathematics within his discipline of economics.

He will therfore be of particular help relative to my goal of becoming acquainted with the major areas of application of mathematics to the social sciences.

C. DR. WILLIAM PACKER

ANTICIPATED CONTRIBUTION: As member of the philosopy department, Dr. Packer will be teaching the two ethics courses that I plan on auditing next year. He will therfore be particularly helpful as I initiate my study in ethics.

IV. PROCEDURES FOR MONITORING PROGRESS

A. Informal consultation with appropriate advisory committee (A.C.) members as the need arises during the year.

B. Meetings with my entire A.C. to discuss progress: first week in October; first week in January.

C. Written progress report to my A.C. and subsequent meeting with entire committee: first week in March.

V. SUMMARY OF BUDGET REQUESTS

Participant: Jack LaPlace

Academic year of plan: July 1981-June 1982

Individualized Development Fund X

Leave of Absence Fund

Cost Categories		Budget Request
1. Purchase of books on applications of mathematics in the social sciences		$ 44.00
2. Summer 1981 conference on Mathematical Models in Economics		
(a) Round-trip airfare to Los Angeles	$375.00	
(b) Registration fee	25.00	
(c) Lodging (July 16-18)	90.00	
(d) Meals	45.00	
Total		535.00
3. Typing of research article		15.00
4. Textbooks for two ethics courses		25.00
TOTAL BUDGET REQUEST		$ 619.00

GORDON COLLEGE
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
BUDGET FORM

PARTICIPANT	DATE OF AWARD
JACK LAPLACE	June 15, 1981

X INDIVIDUALIZED DEVELOPMENT FUND ___ LEAVE OF ABSENCE FUND

ACCOUNT NUMBER FOR ALL TRANSACTIONS IS 07-095-000

COST CATEGORY	Academic year-- APPROVED BUDGET	INCREASES (DECREASES)	REVISED BUDGET
	$	$	$
Book Purchase: Math in Social Sciences	44.00		
Summer 1980 Conference	535.00		
Typing of Research Article	15.00		
Textbooks for Ethics Course	25.00		
TOTALS	$ 619.00	$	$

APPROVAL _____ DEAN OF THE FACULTY 8/13/81 DATE

NOTES

1. Participants in this project may not exceed the approved budgets for each cost category, except that transfer of funds between existing categories not to exceed $50 are authorized without further approval.
2. Changes to any cost category in excess of $50, or requests for new categories or additional allocation must be submitted on a new budget form 75-1025A for the F.D.C. for further approval. Only after the request has been acted on by the F.D.C. and approved by the Dean of the Faculty may expenditures take place against such a revised budget.

FOR BUSINESS OFFICE USE ONLY

APPENDIX III

Jack LaPlace — IDP Fund — 1980 #1 Allocation 6/15/81 — $619.00

Account for IDP Use

Date	Item/Amount	Books Math in Social Sc.	1981 Conf Air Fare	1981 Conf Registration	1981 Conf Lodging	
6 15	Allocation	44.	93.	93.	93.	
2 16	Book Check +2.00	46.00				
7 14	Conf Travel SD 129.68 $30	1.00	30.00			
7 19	Conf Fees $25			25.00		
7 21	Indiana Ide $30			5.00	30.00	
7 20	Lodging Denver $120				6.00	
					114.00	
					120.00	
9 3	Transfer to Research Travel 13.00	33.00			240.00	
		80.00			5.00	

APPENDIX III

Participant Jack LaPlace For Academic Year 1981-82

[x] Self Evaluation [ ] Committee Evaluation

Goal (A, B, etc.) A

1. This goal was fulfilled:
   - [x] Substantially
   - [ ] Partially
   - [ ] Not at all

2. Evaluation comments:

I was able to purchase and read the four books listed under Goal A (see summary of topics attached). They proved to be stimulating and a good introduction to the topic. My thinking on operations research is now at a point where I have formulated specific questions for further study. Several ideas have emerged for new goals which are reflected on my 1981-82 IDP.

3. Recommendations

Continue in-depth reading on operations research and attend one conference in 1982 (see 1982 IDP).

APPENDIX IV

SUGGESTED GUIDELINES FOR ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The Advisory Committee should play a very significant role in the growth that is to be achieved by each participant. Their task is threefold, characterized by the functions of design, implementation, and evaluation. These three functions correspond roughly with three major stages in the growth contract process. The following guidelines will be organized around these three stages, and should be taken as suggestions of some issues for each committee to consider as they work out their role in the individual plan for development.

A. DESIGN STAGE

The Advisory Committee's first involvement with an Individual Development Plan is at that point where the participant has finished his profile and first draft of the current Annual Plan, and has received specific comments on the plan from the FDC. There are at least four functions at this point in which the Advisory Committee should involve itself.

1. The committee and participant should jointly review the plan and the comments received from the FDC. Essentially this constitutes a second review of the integrity of the plan and should proceed along the guidelines used by the FDC as given in Section II-B of this manual. While this may be a rather technical step, it is an important one for the A.C. because the clarity of purpose and specificity of goals necessary for a good plan relate directly to

the ease and validity with which the final evaluation may later be made.

2. In its review of the plan, the A.C. should place a particular emphasis on the means of accomplishment and means of assessment given for each goal. It is the A.C.'s responsibility to insist on a clear understanding of what is to be done, what evidence is to be forthcoming, and perhaps even what criteria will be used to evaluate that evidence. The individual participant and the A.C. alike should benefit from this kind of clarity.

3. Each member of the A.C. will obviously want to review the anticipated contributions listed under his name in the proposed plan. He should likewise look for a clear understanding of that particular role the participant expects him to perform. It might be helpful to reiterate that the personal input and support of the A.C. member is as much sought as is his professional judgment in the process of evaluation.

4. At the point of designing the final draft of the plan, it is important that the participant and his A.C. draw up a realistic evaluation schedule that reflects the elements of support and in-process evaluation which constitutes the committee's function during the implementation stage.

B. IMPLEMENTATION STAGE

The A.C.'s function in this stage is to be sensitive to the progress of the plan. The committee should be in a

position to support the participant's activity in those areas of expertise for which each member presumably was chosen, and to provide the encouragement needed to keep a schedule moving. It would seem appropriate for the A.C. also to be looking for evidence to emerge while there is still opportunity for it to be instructive in the ongoing activities.

C. EVALUATION STAGE

The final involvement of the A.C. is at that point where the participant has completed his activities under the annual plan and has submitted all of the evidence and his written self-evaluation of growth to the committee. Given the individual design and scope of plans encouraged by this program, it seems inappropriate to suggest any hard set of criteria against which they all must be measured. It is suggested, however, that in the exercise of their collective professional judgment the committee consider at least the following items.

1. The A.C.'s written evaluation is not intended primarily as a statement of accountability, although it will be reviewed by the FDC for this purpose. It is, rather, meant to be directed to the individual participant, and represents an important element in the continuing effort of the A.C. to help the faculty member toward his goal of personal and professional growth.
2. There should be some attempt at measuring the degree to which goals have been attained. This quantitative kind of measurement should allow for applauding progress toward a goal even if full

completion has not been achieved.

3. Where a goal has not been fully attained, it may be helpful to pursue the reasons for it. Some of the following questions might be pertinent:

Was the goal too ambitious, either from the outset, or in light of your current knowledge of the individual?

Was the goal inadequately informed?

Did the activity take on a new, more significant, or less far-reaching direction as the participant's knowledge of the area increased?

Does the individual need to concentrate on better planning or management of time?

Was the involvement of the A.C. inadequate? Note that lack of specificity in goals and evidence reflects on the A.C.'s performance of its function.

4. Goals demand going beyond a quantitative evaluation of accomplishment to an assessment of qualitative effects. This assessment obviously rests heavily on the content and intent of the plan as well as on the professional judgment of the Advisory Committee. The following questions are intended only as examples of those which might be pursued by the committee:

To what degree has the activity of the participant contributed to the three general areas of student development, scholarship, or strengthening the institution?

Has the participant's growth led to suggestions for further development?

Could the participant's plan for growth have been more ambitious in light of his capabilities?

5. All of the committee's evaluative comments, but particularly those dealing with the quality of the activities, can easily assume a subjective character. It is suggested that wherever possible reference be made to the evidence on which the comments rest.